

Sayers, Margery

From: Susan Garber <buzysusan23@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 5:00 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB 44-2018

Re: CB 44-2018

Dear Council Chair Sigaty and Members of the County Council,

It's disappointing that the ethics bill is coming up for testimony during the week of early voting and when some families are taking off for their summer vacation-- when public attention is turned elsewhere. Nevertheless I would like to offer the following:

I would urge that in revising any legislation dealing with regulations we attempt to simplify and clarify the wording, as has been declared a goal in the Clarion Development Regulation Assessment effort. So, as an example, I would suggest we try to eliminate double negatives. I consider adding an item for exclusion to be such an example. I can't say I agree with excluding Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs) after consulting a financial advisor on this issue. It is possible to have ETFs with industry specific sectors which could present the possibility of a conflict of interest. For example one might hold an ETF devoted to Green Energy, with solar energy companies being the largest component. Were the Council to be addressing approval of large Solar Farms in the West for example, this would potentially represent "an interest" which should be made public.

I would welcome amendments to the proposed bill that would offer further ethical safeguards. There is nothing to prevent the Council from actually strengthening the measures contained in this bill by:

- 1.) Increasing stated time periods from one year to two
 - 2.) Expand provision for 'spouses' being listed as registered lobbyist to read 'family members'.
 - 3.) Expand application to 'elected officials' to include ' or County employees'.
- Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Susan Garber
Address on file

Sayers, Margery

From: Lisa Markovitz <lmarkovitz@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 9:24 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: People's Voice positions on Bills June 2018

The People's Voice

Positions on current legislation:

CB40 - Support - glad to see these additions to requirements of pre-submission meetings.

CB 44 - Support with amendment - We would like to see a longer term than one year for the prohibition of representing a party for compensation that was a subject of legislation. The "subject" of legislation should also be more strongly defined to include an entity that financially benefits from legislation.

CR 82 - Oppose - seek significant amendment - The allocation chart could be used to plan development by region. When things are crowded in a certain area, allocations could be lowered. When there is room to grow in another area they could be raised. Instead of leaving it to APFO which has limited wait times, to pace growth with infrastructure, allocation waits are unlimited, and therefore, this could be used as a real tool for planning and not just countywide but with regional oversight and analysis.

I also believe new regions should be created for watersheds, with small numbers of units allowed That way there is more time between developments to make sure adequate runoff planning is taking place between changes, without too many affects at once.

We do realize that changing the General Plan requires a ballot question, but even having this tool for bi-annual use could be helpful to analyze what DPZ says is being used, if there are any wait times for allocations, and if not, then if an area is crowded and there is no allocation wait, they should be lowered.